



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

gree of inequality of distribution. This was in accordance with my theory, and was very plainly in my mind at the time my article of a dozen years ago was written. It seems, however, that Mr. Lorenz has misunderstood my article to this extent. My hypothesis had in view such a result as the doubling of a degree of inequality by the doubling of the column of amount of wealth owned. Even if this were not in my mind, the principle was there, nevertheless.

Concerning this Mr. Lorenz writes: "The error in this measure lies in the fact that the distance between the medians varies not only with the degree of concentration (for it does this), but also with changes in the total wealth. Let us suppose each individual's wealth in the above case is doubled. The two medians would now be \$17 and \$19.65, and their difference \$2.65, showing an increase in concentration, but by hypothesis the relative position of the numbers has not changed."

If there is any hypothesis that the relative position of the numbers has not changed, it was and is not mine, nor is it a part of this scheme for measuring distribution. The contrary is true in both cases. A doubling of the degree of inequality which Mr. Lorenz obtains by multiplying the wealth column by 2 is precisely what is to be expected by hypothesis and arithmetical principle.

The foregoing is not to be regarded as in any degree objecting to Mr. Lorenz's thoughtful scheme of graphic presentation.

GEORGE K. HOLMES.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

FAMILY DESERTION.

Publications of the Committee on Social Research of the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York. No. I. In two parts. 200 pp., appendices and tables. 1905.

I. *Five hundred and Seventy-four Deserters and their Families.* By Lilian Brandt. New York City. 64 pp. 1905.

From material contributed by various charitable organizations, Miss Lilian Brandt, of the statistical division of the Charity Organization Society of the city of New York, has obtained valuable information as to the important features of the serious problem of family desertion.

Two earlier studies of this nature—one by Miss Smith of the Associated Charities of Boston in 1901, and the other by the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity in 1902—furnished facts and conclu-

sions which the New York society sought to substantiate by evidence afforded by a large number of cases in various cities. Accordingly, a schedule of selected questions was presented to fifty-four charity organization societies in the United States, with the invitation to assist in gathering material by keeping special record of their cases during the year beginning Nov. 1, 1903. When returns were called for in November, 1904, 591 fairly satisfactory schedules were received from twenty-six societies, representing twenty-five cities and fifteen States. Of these schedules, seventeen were for cases in which the wife had been the deserter, leaving 574 cases of desertion by the husband, which selected schedules have been tabulated by Miss Brandt in minute detail. These records, she says, "afford no evidence whatever as to the prevalence of family desertion, nor as to the amount of destitution that it causes." Many deserted families require no charitable assistance, and, of the families here considered, "41 per cent. had never been dependent before, so far as known."

From the exhaustive data furnished by Miss Brandt in this monograph a summary statement is presented on the opposite page.

The significance of the data furnished by Miss Brandt is indicated by her own conclusion thus stated: "The study of these 574 records results in the conviction that, while here and there the responsibility for desertion may rest with industrial conditions, with ill-considered marriages in early youth or between men and women of irreconcilable differences of temperament, and, somewhat more frequently, with the impossible temper and cooking of the wife, still the most constant element in the situation is the irresponsible, ease-loving man, who acts on the theory that, when hard times of any sort come, he is justified in making arrangements for his own comfort which do not include his wife and children."

Further consideration is given by Miss Brandt to the treatment of the deserted families by the various charitable societies in their attempts to bring about a reconciliation between husband and wife, and in their efforts to secure regular contributions from the husband and from other sources for the use of the families. The later history of the deserters was a subject of inquiry, but of more than one-half of these men it was impossible to determine the whereabouts. The whole treatment of this subject by Miss Brandt, although abounding with statistical details, is nevertheless full of interest and highly suggestive. It may well be considered a working model for further investigation of this all too prevalent social phenomenon.

SUMMARY STATEMENT.

Subject Considered.	Number of Cases.	Percent- age.	Basis of Percent- age.*
No previous desertions by husband	340	59.2	574
Length of absence 6 months or over	145	70.0	234
Children (in 574 families) under 5 years of age	476	28.6	1665
Children (in 574 families) under 14 years of age	1337	80.3	1665
Families without children	20	3.5	574
Families with 1, 2, or 3 children	382	66.6	574
Families with more than 3 children	172	29.9	574
Families with additional members of household	98	17.1	574
Husband and wife of same nationality	361	72.3	499
Husband and wife having same religious belief	363	80.9	449
Husband and wife with disparity of ages over 5 years	130	30.7	424
Husbands under 20 or over 29 years of age at time of marriage	119	34.6	344
Wives under 20 or over 29 years of age at time of marriage	147	40.6	362
Couples married less than 6 years at time of first desertion	137	46.0	298
Husbands under 30 years of age at time of first desertion	122	33.6	363
Husbands having bad habits ascribed to them	412	86.9	474
Husbands having intemperance ascribed to them	325	68.6	474
Husbands known to have had criminal records	70	12.2	574
Husbands who did not work regularly	265	46.2	574
Wives reported as "good" or "fair" housekeepers	307	53.5	574
Wives having bad habits ascribed to them	109	28.5	383
Wives who earned own living before marriage	298	51.9	574
Wives who helped earn family income after marriage	320	55.7	574
Desertion apparently chiefly fault of husband	245	63.5	386
Desertion apparently chiefly fault of wife	46	11.9	386
Desertion apparently matter of equal responsibility	52	13.5	386
Desertion apparently resulting from circumstances beyond control of both	43	11.1	386

II. *Family Desertion and Non-support Laws.* By William H. Baldwin, Washington, D.C. 136 pp., appendices and tables. 1904.

The difficulties experienced by the Associated Charities of Washington in their attempts to compel the husband to support his family led to this compilation of the laws of the different States relating to family desertion and non-support.

Mr. Baldwin opens the work by considering briefly the nature and extent of this growing twofold evil, and claims that, since it is due largely to the moral rather than the physical defect of the husband, it should be treated as a criminal offence, and that society, having an

* Number of cases for which information was furnished under specified subjects.